

TAB 1

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c)

Current orders: 09 Oct 01 - NETC Norfolk Det UIC 88123

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c)

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c)

- 09 OCT 01 - 10 NOV 30

- 10 DEC 01 - Present

- Directed to obtain facilitator certification - Center Personal and Professional Development (CPPD) Department Head Leadership Course (DHLC) and Division Officer Leadership Course (DIVOLC). We were also told we would urgent fill as instructors at Direct Commission Officer Indoctrination Course (DCOIC) at Officer Training School, Newport, RI.

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c)

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c) DHLC Facilitator Certification

- Mar 24-29 - DCOIC

During this class I observed questionable verbal treatment and general disrespect of Officers by an E7 (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) as well as curriculum areas that were incorrect. I offered suggestions to the (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) who was in charge of the class. I also discussed my concerns with the (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) of OTS upon checkout. (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) was present during this meeting. At no time, with any of the previous mentioned personnel were my suggestions or concerns met with defiance, resentment or negative comments.

- Apr 2010 - I was engaged in a casual conversation with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) regarding the DCOIC program. He agreed there was an area of concern and asked me to mention it to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (Recruiting Command) I drafted an email with my observations and sent it to her.

I heard nothing from this nor from my initial conversation with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)

- Apr 2010 - submitted my FIT REP input to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) During a unit conf. call we discussed items of concern. (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) said she didn't feel that there was a reason for concern. I mentioned that (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) had felt there was and that he'd suggested it be mentioned to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) told me I had not following Chain of Command in speaking to them. I told her it was an unofficial/off line conversation in which the topic had come up. That the email was directed by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and that to my knowledge that was the end.

-May 24-29 DCOIC course with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). Again, the treatment and tone was being used with the Officers by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) I also counseled (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) regarding discussion of personal aspects of her life to the class (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)

During this month I had been unsuccessful in scheduling with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) for FITREP debrief. It would be scheduled and she would not be available at prearranged time.

-Jun 03,10 Received "Certified Copy Provided" copy of FITREP via email. I was ranked as (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) with annotated comments regarding DCO. (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) said my marks were justified and that additionally I had been (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) to instruct the DCO course by the (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) of OTS, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) I had never met her nor been counseled regarding my concerns, etc.

I focused my attention to CPPD assignments during the next reporting period. DIVOLC certification in Dec 2010.

I was not provided Mid-Term Counseling nor at any time was I told that failure to instruct at DCOIC would result in continued poor marks on my FITREP.

-Apr 2011 - FITREP input submitted to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)

-May 2011 - Unsuccessful attempts via phone and email to receive debrief of FITREP. I emailed (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (cc'd (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) expressing my concerns about this and the fact that the same thing had happened last year resulting in late submission without time to refute. Almost immediately I

Original Complaint 6 September 2011

received an email from (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) May 28, I received FITREP copy to review. (b)(6) again and again, reference to DCOIC issue - even though I had not been back during this reporting period. Also mentioned was that DCOIC was the unit's primary mission. I had never been told this. I asked if (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) didn't feel that I'd be allowed to return to DCOIC since the (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) was leaving and the (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) was gone. She said that she was sure it was in the (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) pass down and that I would not.

-June 2011 I contacted (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and offered to travel at my own expense in an effort to regain my instructor status. She placed a call to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and was told that the decision stood that I would not be used.

This denial of access to instruct at DCOIC has resulted in loss of ADT opportunities - possibly as many as six, in the form of pay and retirement points and my the low evaluations on my FITREPs - marks and rankings.

I was never counseled by my (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). I was not allowed access to "supposed" negative critique remarks or ADM letter that was written. I asked (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) if any such letter or any type of correspondence was directed to OTS. Both Admirals told me that there had been no such correspondence. My reprisal is based on hearsay and exaggerated information supplied to the (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). I believe by the (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) never attended my class to observe my instruction nor was I ever personally asked about my teaching methods.

I questioned curriculum - content and time management as well as the adverse treatment of Commissioned Officers by Enlisted personnel. I was told these were examples of poor leadership qualities on my part. I believe they are just the opposite and should have been questioned by any SR Office who witnessed this class.

01 - 10 NOV 30

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c)

- 10 DEC 01 - Present

- Directed to obtain facilitator certification - Center Personal and Professional Development (CPPD) Department Head Leadership Course (DHLC) and Division Officer Leadership Course (DIVOLC). We were also told we would urgent fill as instructors at Direct Commission Officer Indoctrination Course (DCOIC) at Officer Training School, Newport, RI.

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c)

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c) - DHLC Facilitator Certification

- Mar 24-29 - DCOIC

During this class I observed questionable verbal treatment and general disrespect of Officers by an E7 (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) as well as curriculum areas that were incorrect. I offered suggestions to the (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) who was in charge of the class. I also discussed my concerns with the (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) of OTS upon checkout. (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) was present during this meeting. At no time, with any of the previous mentioned personnel were my suggestions or concerns met with defiance, resentment or negative comments.

- Apr 2010 - I was engaged in a casual conversation with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) regarding the DCOIC program. He agreed there was an area of concern and asked me to mention it to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (Recruiting Command) I drafted an email with my observations and sent it to her.

I heard nothing from this nor from my initial conversation with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c).
- Apr 2010 - submitted my FIT REP input to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). During a unit conf. call we discussed items of concern. (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) said she didn't feel that there was a reason for concern. I mentioned that (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) had felt there was and that he'd suggested it be mentioned to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c).

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c) told me I had not following Chain of Command in speaking to them. I told her it was an

unofficial/off line conversation in which the topic had come up. That the email was directed by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and that to my knowledge that was the end.

-May 24-29 DCOIC course with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). Again, the treatment and tone was being used with the Officers by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). I also counseled (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) regarding discussion of personal aspects of her life to the class (b)(6) (b)(7)(c).

During this month I had been unsuccessful in scheduling with (b)(6) (b)(7) for FITREP debrief. It would be scheduled and she would not be available at prearranged time.

-Jun 03,10 Received "Certified Copy Provided" copy of FITREP via email. I was ranked as (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) with annotated comments regarding DCO. (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) said my marks were justified and that additionally I had been "uninvited back" to instruct the DCO course by the (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) of OTS, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). I had never met her nor been counseled regarding my concerns, etc.

I focused my attention to CPPD assignments during the next reporting period. DIVOLC certification in Dec 2010.

I was not provided Mid-Term Counseling nor at any time was I told that failure to instruct at DCOIC would result in continued poor marks on my FITREP.

-Apr 2011 - FITREP input submitted to (b)(6) (b)(7).

-May 2011 - Unsuccessful attempts via phone and email to receive debrief of FITREP. I emailed (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) cc'd (b)(6) (b)(7) expressing my concerns about this and the fact that the same thing had happened last year resulting in late submission without time to refute. Almost immediately I received an email from (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). May 28, I received FITREP copy to review. (b)(6) (b)(7) again and again, reference to DCOIC issue - even though I had not been back during this reporting period. Also mentioned was that DCOIC was the unit's primary mission. I had never been told this. I asked if (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) didn't feel that I'd be allowed to return to DCOIC since the (b)(6) (b)(7) was leaving and the (b)(6) (b)(7) was gone. She said that she was sure it was in the (b)(6) (b)(7) pass down and that I would not.

-June 2011 I contacted (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and offered to travel at my own expense in an effort to regain my instructor status. She placed a call to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and was told that the decision stood that I would not be used.

This denial of access to instruct at DCOIC has resulted in loss of ADT opportunities - possibly as many as six, in the form of pay and retirement points and my the low evaluations on my FITREPs - marks and rankings.

I was never counseled by my (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). I was not allowed access to "supposed" negative critique remarks or ADM letter that was written. I asked (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) if any such letter or any type of correspondence was directed to OTS. Both Admirals told me that there had been no such correspondence. My reprisal is based on hearsay and exaggerated information supplied to the (b)(6) (b)(7). I believe by the (b)(6) (b)(7) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) never attended my class to observe my instruction nor was I ever personally asked about my teaching methods.

I questioned curriculum - content and time management as well as the adverse treatment of Commissioned Officers by Enlisted personnel. I was told these were examples of poor leadership qualities on my part. I believe they are just the opposite and should have been questioned by any SR Office who witnessed this class.

TAB 2



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER NAVY RESERVE FORCES COMMAND
1915 FORRESTAL DRIVE
NORFOLK, VIRGINIA 23551-4615

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5041
Ser N002/1183
19 Sep 11

From: Commander, Navy Reserve Forces Command
To: Naval Inspector General

Subj: REPORT OF REPRISAL ALLEGATIONS - NAVY HOTLINE NUMBER
201102849

1. In accordance with Title 10 of U.S. Code Section 1034, we provide the following information concerning an allegation of reprisal.

a. Date complaint of reprisal received: 6 September 2011

b. **Complainant:** (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)
Duty Title: (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)
Organization: NR FLETRACEN Norfolk

c. **Subject:** (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)
Duty Title: (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)
Organization: NR FLETRACEN Norfolk

d. **Subject:** (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)
Duty Title: (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)
Organization: Officer Training School, Newport, RI

2. Protected Communication(s):

a. In April 2010, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) communicated information which she reasonably believed evidenced a violation of law or regulation to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) she reported that she had observed questionable verbal treatment and general disrespect of officers by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) during the Direct Commission Officer Indoctrination Course (DCOIC).

b. In April 2010, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) communicated information which she reasonably believed evidenced a violation of law or regulation to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) NR FLETRACEN Norfolk. According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) she reported she had observed questionable verbal treatment and general disrespect of officers by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) during the DCOIC.

~~OFFICIAL USE ONLY - PRIVACY SENSITIVE~~

~~Any misuse or unauthorized disclosure may result in both civil and criminal penalties.~~

Subj: REPORT OF REPRISAL ALLEGATIONS - NAVY HOTLINE NUMBER
201102849

3. Personnel Action(s).

a. On or about 28 May 2011, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) received a declining Fitness Report (FITREP) under the same reporting senior.

4. Recommend conducting a preliminary inquiry of (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) reprisal complaint to determine whether or not the alleged unfavorable personnel action warrants further investigation.

5. My point of contact for this notification is (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) at (757) 322-(b)(6) (b)(7)(c), DSN 262-(b)(6) (b)(7)(c), or (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) @navy.mil.

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c)

By direction

~~OFFICIAL USE ONLY - PRIVACY SENSITIVE~~

~~Any misuse or unauthorized disclosure may result in both civil and criminal penalties.~~

TAB 3

14 Oct 2005

RIGHTS ACKNOWLEDGEMENT/ELECTION FORMAT
MILITARY WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT (10 U.S.C. 1034)
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RIGHTS AND ELECTION OF INVESTIGATIVE PROCEDURES

I, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (name and rank/grade) spoke to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (name and rank/grade), who is the (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (position and command), concerning my complaint of reprisal for making, or preparing to make, a communication that I believe is protected by 10 U.S.C. 1034. This person informs me that he/she does ☒ does not ☐ work in the office of an Inspector General within the Department of Defense who is authorized to receive my complaint of reprisal pursuant to applicable DoD and SECNAV instructions.

I understand that in order to obtain all of the procedural rights provided by 10 U.S.C. 1034, I must submit my complaint of reprisal to DoDIG, NAVINSGEN, DNIGMC/IGMC, or an Inspector General within the Department of Defense designated to receive military whistleblower reprisal complaints. I understand these rights include the following

- (1) completion of the investigation within 180 days;
- (2) a report format that requires a thorough review of the facts and circumstances relevant to the allegations, relevant documents acquired during the investigation and summaries of interviews conducted;
- (3) provision of a redacted copy of the report of investigation to the member
- (4) advice and assistance in filing a request for correction of the member's military record when implementation of the recommendations of the report requires action by a board for correction of military records;
- (5) provision of a copy of the report of investigation to a board for correction of military records and Inspector General assistance in gathering further evidence the board may request
- (6) review of the board's decision by the Secretary of the Military Department; and
- (7) review of the Secretary's decision by the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Program Integration; and

I also understand that if I choose not to submit my complaint to an Inspector General within the Department of Defense, I may ask my chain of command to investigate my allegation of reprisal, but in that case I will not be entitled to the procedural rights listed above.

I understand that (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) is an Inspector General within the Department of Defense who would may receive my complaint of reprisal, and that I may submit my complaint using the following postal address, electronic address or fax number, or that upon my written request, my complaint will be forwarded for me. CNRF 1915 Forrest / Dr. Norfolk, VA 23551

I understand that I may send my request directly to DoDIG, NAVINSGEN, or DNIGMC/IGMC, using the information provided below, or that upon my written request, my complaint will be forwarded for me. Based on the foregoing, I have decided (initial one, write "no" in the other two):

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c) initial/no I will submit my complaint directly to CNRF 16 (specify DoDIG, NAVINSGEN, DNIGMC/IGMC, or the Inspector General within the Department of Defense identified above).

NO (initial/no) I request that my complaint be forwarded to _____ (specify DoDIG, NAVINSGEN, DNIGMC/IGMC or the Inspector General within the Department of Defense identified above).

NO (initial/no) I request that my complaint be investigated by my chain of command. I understand that I will not be entitled to the procedural rights listed above.

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (signature) 08 Dec 11 (date)

Witnessed by J

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (signature) 8 Dec 11 (date)

Defense Hotline
The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301
800-424-9098
Fax 703-404-8567
www.dodig.mil/

Naval Inspector General
1254 Ninth Street SE
Washington Navy Yard, DC 20374-5006
800-522-3451
Fax 202-433-2613
www.ig.navy.mil

Deputy Naval Inspector General
for Marine Corps Matters
Washington, DC 20380
703-614-1348/9/1698
Fax 703-697-6690
http://hqinet001.hqmc.usmc.mil/ig/ig/

Enclosure (1)

TAB 4



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER NAVY RESERVE FORCES COMMAND
1915 FORRESTAL DRIVE
NORFOLK, VIRGINIA 23551-4615

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5041
Ser N002/1499
27 Dec 11

~~SENSITIVE - FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

From: Commander, Navy Reserve Forces Command
To: Naval Inspector General (N62)

Subj: NAVY HOTLINE CASE 201102849

Ref: (a) DoDD 7050.06
(b) Naval Inspector General Investigations Manual

Encl: (1) 201102849 Report of Inquiry

1. Per references (a) and (b), a preliminary inquiry was conducted regarding allegations of reprisal. Enclosure (1) contains the findings of the preliminary inquiry that was completed.
2. I concur with the findings and recommendations of the investigating officer. I recommend that further investigation is required.
3. My point of contact for this investigation is (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and he can be reached at (757) 322-(b)(6) (b)(7), DSN 262-(b)(6) (b)(7), Email: (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)@navy.mil.

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c)

By direction

~~OFFICIAL USE ONLY - PRIVACY SENSITIVE~~

Any misuse or unauthorized disclosure may result in both civil and criminal penalties.

RECORD OF PRELIMINARY INQUIRY
HOTLINE # 201102849

Complainant Name/Rank or Grade/Service:

Name: (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)
Rank: (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)

Job Title and Duty Location:

Job Position: (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)
Direct Commission Officer
Indoctrination Course (DCOIC),
Officer Training School (OTS),
Newport, RI.
Base or City, State: Navy Reserve
Navy Education Training Command
Detachment Norfolk (NR NETC Det
Norfolk)

Background:

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c) is a (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) officer currently assigned to NR (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Norfolk. According to her last three performance evaluations, her primary duty is that of an (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). In August 2011, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) met with Commander, Navy Reserve Force Office of the Inspector General (CNRF IG) and informally discussed allegations concerning reprisal. On 6 September 2011, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) contacted CNRF IG to formally report allegations of reprisal involving members of her chain of command.

In (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) attended the (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) as a (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). She holds a (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) in (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) was the former (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), and is a (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). Prior to retiring from her civilian employer, she had been a (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) for (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) years.

According to the DCOIC website: "The Direct Commission Officer Indoctrination Course is the foundation for your success as a member of the Naval Officer Corps. The course is comprehensive, intense, and designed to facilitate your introduction to your responsibilities as a naval officer. The course will also introduce the newly commissioned officer to the military

~~FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY - PRIVACY SENSITIVE~~

~~Any misuse or unauthorized disclosure may result in both civil and criminal penalties.~~

structure of the United States Navy, the rich history of traditions and customs, our legal system and finally, military etiquette. DCOIC is extremely demanding both physically and mentally"
<<http://www.ocs.navy.mil/dcoic.asp>>.

Protected Communications (PC):

- **29 March 2010.** PC 1 According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), she spoke with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), OTS, and disclosed that she had observed verbal maltreatment and disrespect of DCOIC students by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). She also spoke with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) concerning her perception regarding DCOIC's shift in curriculum and philosophy. As (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) reasonably believed that (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) actions evidenced a violation of law or regulation, and as she disclosed these alleged violations to "Any person or organization in the chain of command" (DoDD 7050.06), her conversation is considered a protected communication.
- **April 2010.** PC 2 According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), she spoke with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), NR (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Norfolk, and disclosed that she had observed verbal maltreatment and disrespect of DCOIC students by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). She also spoke with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) concerning her perception regarding DCOIC's shift in curriculum and philosophy. As (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) reasonably believed that (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) actions evidenced a violation of law or regulation, and as she disclosed these alleged violations to "Any person or organization in the chain of command" (DoDD 7050.06), her conversation is considered a protected communication.
- **April 2010.** PC 3 According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) she spoke with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (then) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) during a conference and disclosed to him that she had observed verbal maltreatment and disrespect of DCOIC students by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). She also spoke with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) concerning her perception regarding DCOIC's shift in curriculum and philosophy.

¹ At the time of the communication, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) was assigned as (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) therefore, he is considered part of (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) administrative chain of command.

According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) suggested that (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) forward her concerns via email to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Navy Recruiting Command.² As (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) reasonably believed that (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) actions evidenced a violation of law or regulation, and as she disclosed these alleged violations to "Any person or organization in the chain of command" (DoDD 7050.06), her conversation is considered a protected communication.

- **May or June 2010.** PC 4 According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), she disclosed to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Commander, Navy Reserve Forces Command (CNRFC),³ that she had observed verbal maltreatment and disrespect of DCOIC students by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). She also spoke with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) concerning her perception regarding DCOIC's shift in curriculum and philosophy. As (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) reasonably believed that (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) actions evidenced a violation of law or regulation, and as she disclosed these alleged violations to "Any person or organization in the chain of command" (DoDD 7050.06), her conversation is considered a protected communication.
- **August 2011.** PC 5 (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) met with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Deputy Inspector General, CNRF, and disclosed allegations of reprisal concerning herself. As (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) had made a "lawful communication to...an IG" (DoDD 7050.06), her conversation is considered a protected communication.
- **6 September 2011.** PC 6 (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) filed a Complaint of Reprisal with CNRF IG. As (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) made a "lawful communication to...an IG" (DoDD 7050.06), her conversation is considered a protected communication.

² According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), she did email (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), but did not receive a reply. Although Recruiting Command is responsible for recruiting candidates for the Direct Commissioned Officer program, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) is neither in (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) operational chain of command nor her administrative chain of command; therefore, the email is not considered a protected communication.

³ Although (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) approached (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) as a personal friend, mentor, and fellow (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), the fact that (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) is assigned to CNRFC makes her part of (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) administrative chain of command.

Unfavorable Personnel Action(s)/Responsible Management Officials/Prior Knowledge:

Date: Unfavorable Personnel Action(s)	Responsible Management Officials(s) (RMO)	RMO Knowledge of PC(s) Before Taking UPA Ans: Yes, No, or Unk
UPA 1 (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (May or June 2010)	(b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Norfolk	Yes ⁴
UPA 2 Directed to Cancel Orders (18 June 2010):	(b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Norfolk	Yes
UPA 3 FITREP (30 May 2011)	(b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Norfolk	Yes
UPA 4 (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (July 2011)	(b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)	Unknown Unknown
UPA 5 FITREP (30 November 2011)	(b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Norfolk	Yes
UPA 6 (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) December 2011	(b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Norfolk	Unknown Unknown Yes

⁴ Knowledge of PC established from an email dated 19 May 2011 from (b)(6) (b)(7) to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). In this email, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) writes: "It is your choice to reach out to the skipper but in doing so, please make sure that you are accurate. In my opinion, I think this is another reflection of (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)"

UPA 1 Relieved as (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (May or June 2010):

- According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) on or about May or June 2010, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) told her that she would not be invited back to OTS to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). As this action reflects a "significant change in duties or responsibilities inconsistent with the military member's grade" (DoDD 7050.06), which affects or has the potential to affect the military member's current position or career, it is considered an unfavorable personnel action; however, as (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) did not report this alleged reprisal to an authorized IG until August 2011 (more than one year after the alleged personnel action), it is viewed as untimely. [SKE 10]

Recommendation: No investigation is required as the complaint was made to an authorized IG more than 60 days after the complainant became aware of the personnel action.

UPA 2 Directed to Cancel Orders (18 June 2010):

- According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), on or about 18 June 2010, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) directed her to cancel her previously-submitted orders request in the Navy Reserve Order Writing System (NROWS), which had previously been submitted by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) as a result of her being directed to cancel her orders request, she did not receive pay and retirement points, which she would have received if the orders had been executed. As this action reflects a "decision on pay" (DoDD 7050.06), which affects or has the potential to affect the military member's current position or career, it is considered an unfavorable personnel action; however, as (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) did not report this alleged reprisal to an authorized IG until August 2011 (more than one year after the alleged action), it is viewed as untimely. [SKE 15]

Recommendation: No investigation is required as the complaint was made to an authorized IG more than 60 days after the complainant became aware of the personnel action.

UPA 3 FITREP (30 May 2011):

- On 30 May 2011, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) issued a FITREP to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) for the period 1 May 2010 to 30 April 2011. The Promotion Recommendation (block 43) was marked (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). The Member Trait Average (block 45) was (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and measured against a Summary Group Average of (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). Teamwork (block 36) was marked (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). Leadership was marked (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). All other Performance Traits were marked (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). As this action was related to "a performance evaluation" (DoDD 7050.06), which affects or has the potential to affect the military member's current position or career, it is considered an unfavorable personnel action. CNRF IG considers the complaint timely for the following reasons: (1) according to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) she did not receive a copy of the FITREP until June 2011; (2) in August 2011, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) spoke with CNRF IG concerning the FITREP in question; and (3) the FITREP was manipulated on or prior to 6 December 2011. [SKE 14]
- Note: The Official Record Copy (posted to BUPERS on 6 December 2011) appears to have been resigned by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and the date has been changed from 30 May 2011 to 23 May 2011.
- In an email dated 19 May 2011 (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) writes to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) "It is your choice to reach out to the skipper but in doing so, please make sure that you are accurate. In my opinion, I think this is another (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)
- (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) provided CNRF IG with a document which she claims to be a draft copy of the FITREP in question. In the Comments on Performance section (block 41) it reads: "During this period, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) was (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) of her primary responsibility as (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) due to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)
- Prior to this UPA, up to four protected communications had occurred.

Recommendation: Recommend a full investigation of this UPA.

UPA 4 (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (July 2011):

- According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) on or about July 2011, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) NR NETC Pensacola, decided that (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) would not be permitted to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) any courses associated with OTS. As this action reflects a "significant change in duties or responsibilities inconsistent with the military member's grade" (DoDD 7050.06), which affects or has the potential to affect the military member's current position or career, it is considered an unfavorable personnel action. [SKE 16]
- Prior to this UPA, up to four protected communications had occurred.

Recommendation: Recommend a full investigation of this UPA.

UPA 5 FITREP (30 November 2011):

- On 30 November 2011, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) issued a FITREP to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) for the period 1 May 2011 to 30 November 2011. The Promotion Recommendation (block 43) was marked (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). The Member Trait Average (block 45) was (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and measured against a Summary Group Average of (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). All other Performance Traits were marked (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) [SKE 19]
- The Official Record Copy (posted to BUPERS on 6 December 2011) appears to have had the Summary Group Average changed from (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and the Promotion Recommendation changed from (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c).
- As this action was related to "a performance evaluation" (DoDD 7050.06), which affects or has the potential to affect the military member's current position or career, and as the changed document indicates a (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Recommendation from that originally issued to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), it is considered an unfavorable personnel action.

- Prior to this UPA, up to six protected communications had occurred.

Recommendation: Recommend a full investigation of this UPA.

UPA 6 (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (2 December 2011):

- According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), she was told by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) that (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), had told (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) that the determination was firm and that (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) would not be permitted to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) associated with OTS. As this action reflects a "significant change in duties or responsibilities inconsistent with the military member's grade" (DoDD 7050.06), which affects or has the potential to affect the military member's current position or career, it is considered an unfavorable personnel action. [SKE 20]
- In an email dated 2 December 2011, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) writes: "Hi (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) - as a follow-up to our discussion this morning, I vetted your request to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) DOLC at OTC with the (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and the decision remains as previously communicated to you by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c),"
- Prior to this UPA, up to six protected communications took place.

Recommendation: Recommend a full investigation of this UPA.

Final Recommendation: UPAs 1 and 2 are considered to be untimely. Recommend a full investigation of UPAs 3, 4, 5, and 6 to determine the Responsible Management Officials' knowledge concerning (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) protected communications and to determine if the personnel actions would have taken place absent the protected communications.

Final Recommendation: Refer for full investigation.

Investigator:

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c)

Signature /

27 Dec 2011
Date

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c)

Printed Name /

Inspector General:

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c)

Signature

27 Dec 11
Date

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c)

Printed Name

Sequence of Key Events

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c)

United States Navy (USN)

1. **24-29 March 2010.** According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Navy Reserve Navy Education Training Command Detachment Norfolk (NR NETC Det Norfolk), while she was on official orders to Officer Training School (OTS) as an (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) for the Direct Commissioned Officer Indoctrination Course (DCOIC), she observed "questionable verbal treatment and general disrespect of Officers" by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) DCOIC Instructor. According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), she observed (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) yelling in the faces of DCOIC students and speaking to them in a demeaning manner. Additionally, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) noted a dramatic shift in curriculum and philosophy, from when she had been DCOIC (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). Following (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) observations, she spoke directly with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) concerning his behavior. She also spoke with a peer instructor, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), DCOIC (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) concerning (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) behavior as well as her perception regarding DCOIC's shift in curriculum and philosophy.
2. **29 March 2010.** According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) she spoke with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) OTC, and disclosed to him what she had observed regarding (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). She also spoke with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) concerning her perception regarding DCOIC's shift in curriculum and philosophy.
3. **April 2010.** According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) she spoke with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) former (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), during a conference and disclosed to him that she had observed verbal maltreatment and disrespect of DCOIC students by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). She also spoke with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) concerning her perception regarding DCOIC's shift in curriculum and philosophy. According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) suggested that (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) forward her concerns via email to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Navy Recruiting Command.

4. April 2010. According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), she spoke with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) NR (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Norfolk, and disclosed that she had observed verbal maltreatment and disrespect of DCOIC students by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). She also spoke with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) concerning her perception regarding DCOIC's shift in curriculum and philosophy.
5. 30 April 2010. (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Norfolk, issued a Fitness Report (FITREP) to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) for the period 1 November 2009 to 30 April 2010. The Promotion Recommendation (block 43) was marked (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). The Member Trait Average (block 45) was (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (measured against a Summary Group Average of (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)). Military Bearing (block 35) was marked (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). Leadership (block 38) was marked (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). All other Performance Traits were marked (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). The Comments on Performance section (block 41) included the comment: "****A PROVEN LEADER! SELECT NOW FOR (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) ****" It should be noted that no one in the Summary Group was awarded an (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)—even though one of the four commanders evaluated could have been identified as such. *Note: The Official Record Copy (posted to BUPERS on 6 December 2011) appears to have been resigned by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and the date has been left blank. Additionally, the Summary Group Average has been changed from (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)*
6. May 2010. According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) while she was on orders to OTS as an (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) for the DCOIC, she observed (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) calling DCOIC students "cockroaches."
7. May or June 2010. According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), she disclosed to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Commander, Navy Reserve Forces Command (CNRFC), that she had observed verbal maltreatment and disrespect of DCOIC students by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). She also spoke with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) concerning her perception regarding DCOIC's shift in curriculum and philosophy.
8. May or June 2010. According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) contacted (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Officer Training School (OTC), Newport, RI, to discuss the allegations and concerns relayed to her by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) related to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and the DCOIC.

Note: According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) are personal friends.

9. May or June 2010. According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) contacted (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Norfolk, and discussed the allegations related to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and the DCOIC (which (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) had disclosed to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c).

10. May or June 2010. According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) contacted (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and told her that (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) would not be invited back to OTC to instruct DCOIC.

11. May or June 2010. According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), she disclosed to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Navy Recruiting Command, via email that she had observed verbal maltreatment and disrespect of DCOIC students by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) DCOIC Instructor. She also disclosed to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) her perception regarding DCOIC's shift in curriculum and philosophy.

12. May or June 2010. According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) told (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) that she would not be invited back to OTC to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) DCOIC.

13. 30 MAY 2011. According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) provided her with a draft copy of her May 2011 FITREP, prior to it being signed. In the Comments on Performance (block 41) section of this document a sentence appears which reads: "During this period, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) was (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) of her primary responsibility as DCOIC (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) due to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) " *Note: this statement does not appear in the final version of (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) FITREP ending 30 April 2011.*

14. 30 May 2011. (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) issued a FITREP to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) for the period 1 May 2011 to 30 April 2011. The Promotion Recommendation (block 43) was marked (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). The Member Trait Average (block 45) was (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (down from (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and measured against a Summary Group Average of (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). Teamwork (block 36) was marked (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), and Leadership was marked (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (down from (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). All other Performance Traits were marked (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). *Note the Official Record Copy (posted to*

BUPERS on 6 December 2011) appears to have been resigned by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and the date has been changed from 30 May 2011 to 23 May 2011.

15. 18 June 2010. According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) directed her to cancel her previously-submitted orders request in the Navy Reserve Order Writing System (NROWS), which had been submitted by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) to instruct at the DCOIC. According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), as a result of her being directed to cancel her orders request, she did not receive pay and retirement points, which she would have received if the orders had been executed.
16. July 2011. According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) communicated information concerning (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) protected communications to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) NETC. As a result of that conversation, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) decided that (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) would not be permitted to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) any (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) associated with OTS.
17. August 2011. (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) met with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), CNRF, and disclosed allegations of reprisal concerning herself.
18. 6 September 2011. (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) filed a Complaint of Reprisal with CNRF IG.
19. 30 November 2011. (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) issued a FITREP to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) for the period 1 May 2011 to 30 November 2011. The Promotion Recommendation (block 43) was marked (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). The Member Trait Average (block 45) was (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (up from (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and measured against a Summary Group Average of (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)). All other Performance Traits were marked (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). *Note the Official Record Copy (posted to BUPERS on 6 December 2011) appears to have had the Summary Group Average changed from (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) and the Promotion Recommendation changed from (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)*
20. 2 December 2011. According to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), she was told by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) that (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) OTS, had told (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) OTS, that the determination was firm and that (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) would not be permitted to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) any (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) associated with OTS.

TAB 5



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
COMMANDER NAVY RESERVE FORCES COMMAND
1915 FORRESTAL DRIVE
NORFOLK, VIRGINIA 23551-4615

IN REPLY REFER TO:
5041
8 Jan 13

~~SENSITIVE - FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY~~

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

From: Inspector General, Commander Navy Reserve Force

Subj: ALLEGATIONS DISCOVERED BY COMNAVRESFOR IG

1. **Origin of Complaint.** On 6 September 2011, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Norfolk, filed a Hotline complaint with COMNAVRESFOR IG. The complaint included allegations related to Military Whistleblower Reprisal. Case number 201102849 was assigned to track and monitor the complaint, and the Office of the Naval Inspector General tasked COMNAVRESFOR IG with conducting a full Military Whistleblower Reprisal Investigation. While investigating the case, COMNAVRESFOR IG discovered information which appears contrary to the Department of the Navy's Policy on Hazing (SECNAVINST 1610.2A).

2. **Complainant's Background.** (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) is a (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) officer assigned to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Norfolk. According to her last three Fitness Reports, her primary duty is that of (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). In (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) She holds a (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) was the former DCOIC (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) from (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), and is a (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). Prior to retiring from her civilian employer, she had been a (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) for (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) years.

3. **Allegations.** On 1 June 2010, in an email to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Commander, Navy Reserve Force, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) describes her observations of the May 2010 DCOIC, managed by Officer Training Command (OTC), Newport, RI:¹ "On Thurs noon was their first meal allowed without holding knowledge books in front of them..." Further in the email, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) writes: "This class was sent to the 'beach'—sand on several occasions as a result of different infractions such as saying 'Yes, Sir' to the Chief [(b)(6) (b)(7)(c) OTC] instead of the 'Yes, Chief' he expected. While in the sand they were directed to kick their

¹ As posted on the DCOIC website: "The purpose of this course is to provide Direct Commissioned Reserve Officers Military Indoctrination Training necessary to prepare them to function in their role as newly commissioned Naval Officer [sic]. It provides a basic introduction into fundamental aspects of leadership while providing a working knowledge of available references." Last modified 6/23/2011.
<http://www.ocs.navy.mil/dcoic_program_overview.asp>

legs and arms 'like the cockroaches they are.'" Further in the email, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) writes: "During the March visit--cold temps--the class was marching about without jackets--khaki sleeve only. I asked why. Because they are expected to march in formation everywhere they go none were allowed jackets because one had forgotten theirs."

4. **Standard.** SECNAVINST 1610.2A defines hazing as: "...any conduct whereby a military member or members, regardless of service or rank, without proper authority causes another military member or members, regardless of service or rank, to suffer or be exposed to any activity which is cruel, abusive, humiliating, oppressive, demeaning, or harmful." SECNAVINST 1610.2A also states: "Hazing does not include command-authorized or operation activities; the requisite training to prepare for such missions or operations; administrative corrective measures; extra military instruction; athletics events, command-authorized physical training, contests or competitions and other similar activities that are authorized by the chain of command." COMNAVRESFOR IG has no knowledge as to whether or not the allegations described above were "authorized by the chain of command" (i.e., OTC).

5. **Preliminary Inquiry.** As a matter of due diligence related to verifying (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) various protected communications COMNAVRESFOR IG interviewed (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) OTC; four former DCOIC students (identified below as Student #1, #2, #3, and #4) who attended DCOIC during the time in question; and one OTC Newport civil service employee. Summaries of those interviews appear below. All interviewees were placed under oath prior to responding to any questions.

6. **Testimony of** (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) **OTC.**

a. On 14 March 2012, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) provided the following sworn testimony:

b. CNRF IG: The investigation that was done, did that include this cockroach issue?

c. (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) Absolutely, it did.

d. CNRF IG: And that was----

e. (b)(6) (b)(7)(c): And there was no evidence of hazing found. She (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) didn't--she's not a truthful person, she didn't reflect things--you know. Yes, she's not a truthful person.

f. On 28 March 2012, after being reminded that she remained under oath from 14 March 2012, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) provided the following sworn testimony:

g. Note: During this second interview, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) had legal counsel present.

h. CNRF IG: After our discussion on 14 March, we talked about the alleged behaviors of having the officers lie down in the sand, putting their hands and legs up in the air, being called cockroaches (allegedly), and you said that there was an investigation conducted. Was that by OTC?

i. (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) No, I didn't say there was an investigation conducted. What I said was, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c)

7. Testimony of Student #1. Student #1 is a (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) who arrived at DCOIC as a commissioned officer. Student #1 is self-described as an (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) individual. Student #1 stated that DCOIC students were directed to hold their green memorandum booklets at arm's length and read silently from them until the rest of the group had obtained their food and had gathered at the common table to sit and eat. Student #1 stated: "I didn't feel great about that," calling the experience "slightly uncomfortable." Student #1 described being marched to the "sandpit" in the following manner: While lying on their backs in sand, students were directed to raise their hands and legs up in the air. While in this position, students were called "cockroaches" by one or more Chief Petty Officers (CPO) assigned to the DCOIC staff. Student #1 also stated that students were directed to fill their pockets with sand and to execute jumping jacks with handfuls of sand. Student #1 commented on the fact that s/he outranked the instructor who had called him/her a "cockroach." Student #1 believes that the experience of lying on ones back in the sand, being yelled at, and being called a "cockroach" was "demeaning." Student #1 further described the experience as building "resentment," and used such terms as "demeaning" and "cruel" when describing the experience.

8. Testimony of Student #2. Student #2 is a management-level (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) who arrived at DCOIC as a commissioned officer with over (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) of military experience. Student #2 explained

how DCOIC students would participate in additional physical training (PT) sessions called "going to the beach." According to Student #2, when unit tasking was not accomplished, "extra activity" would result. This extra activity included PT, pushups, and sit-ups in the sand. According to Student #2, students were directed to fill their shorts' pockets with sand and "duck walk" with sand in their pockets as well as execute jumping jacks with handfuls of sand. Student #2 recalls being directed to execute the "dead bug" position once while in the sand. Student #2 also explained how DCOIC students would hold their memorandum booklets at arm's length, perpendicular to the deck. Student #2 described one of the DCOIC CPO instructors as "rude," "insensitive," and "overbearing."

9. **Testimony of Student #3.** Student #3 is a (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) who arrived at DCOIC in 2010 as a commissioned officer. Student #3 explained how, while at DCOIC, students rolled around and crawled around in the sand while they were called "cockroaches" by a DCOIC instructor. Student #3 described how DCOIC instructors had pulled all personal items from their lockers; and, as a result of this, items had been lost. According to Student #3, all DCOIC students were expected to lie in the sand, unless they had a medical excuse. According to Student #3, all DCOIC students knew they could only be "kept in the sand box" for 15 minutes at a time. Accordingly, they knew there was an end in sight, as they were "on the clock." Student #3 stated that, "Whenever we did something wrong," DCOIC instructors would articulate "threats" such as "We're going to withhold liberty" for the weekend. Student #3 (self-described as (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)) stated that fellow students "didn't see the point of those activities." Student #3 stated that students were expected to hold their memorandum booklets at arm's length while in line for chow and while waiting for all unit members to get their food and arrive at the table to sit. According to Student #3, this would sometimes last up to 15 minutes. According to Student #3, a DCOIC staff member told a DCOIC student, "Good morning, sir. You look like shit." Student #3 explained how, in May 2010, while it was cold and raining, students were directed to march in formation without their jackets. According to Student #3, this continued for the entire morning period—both in and out of doors. *It should be noted that, during the period in question, mean temperatures for the local area ranged from 44.4 degrees Fahrenheit to 62.3 degrees Fahrenheit, with the lowest temperature being recorded at 37.9 degrees Fahrenheit (source: <<http://weathersource.com/account/official-weather?location=02841&start-date=05%2F01...>>). Student #3*

~~OFFICIAL USE ONLY - PRIVACY SENSITIVE~~

~~Any misuse or unauthorized disclosure may result in both civil and criminal penalties~~

described how a DCOIC student had been singled out by the DCOIC staff, and how the unit was punished for the student's alleged behavior. According to Student #3, this group punishment resulted in DCOIC students later singling out the subject student.

10. Testimony of Student #4. Student #4 was reluctant to have the interview recorded, and asked to be documented as a confidential witness. COMNAVRESFOR IG honored Student #4's wishes, and did not record the interview. Student #4 holds a (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) in 2010 as a commissioned officer. Student #4 stated that DCOIC students would keep their memorandum booklets at arm's length for no more than five minutes. Student #4 stated that DCOIC students felt "humiliated." Although Student #4 was not called a "cockroach," Student #4's statement included hearsay evidence that other DCOIC students had been called "cockroaches."

11. Testimony of OTC Newport Civil Service Employee. COMNAVRESFOR IG contacted an OTC Newport civil service employee who was present during the period in question. The interviewee had specific knowledge that DCOIC students had been called "cockroaches." The interviewee viewed this term as both "demeaning" and "disrespectful." Concerning (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) the interviewee stated that the officers had lost a lot of respect for him. The interviewee stated that s/he had heard from students of more than one DCOIC class that the term "cockroaches" had been directed toward DCOIC students. During an end of course reception, the interviewee heard both DCOIC students and (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) referring to the term "cockroach." The interviewee has not aware of any investigation or inquiry related to the treatment of DCOIC students.

12. Interview with (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). As part of the Military Whistleblower Reprisal Investigation, COMNAVRESFOR IG attempted to contact (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) for an interview. Although (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) had transferred from OTC, COMNAVRESFOR IG successfully reached him via phone (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) fully cooperated with COMNAVRESFOR IG during the phone interview and answered several questions related to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) alleged unfavorable personnel actions. Following the phone interview, COMNAVRESFOR IG emailed (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) several questions related to (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) protected communications. After receiving this email, (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) responded that, after seeking legal counsel, he elected to exercise his right to remain silent. Accordingly, COMNAVRESFOR IG respected his request.

13. Recommendation. Initiate an IG case in the Naval Inspector General Hotline Tracking System (NIGHTS) to officially document the allegation of hazing, and then transfer the case to NETC IG. Due to the marked disparity between (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) comments and those provided by (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), the four DCOIC students, and the OTC staff member, COMNAVRESFOR IG recommends that NETC IG determine: (1) if the information above constitutes an allegation of hazing as defined in SECNAVINST 1610.2A; (2) if an investigation/inquiry related to alleged hazing at DCOIC was conducted in 2010; and (3) if further investigation related to alleged hazing of DCOIC students in 2010 is warranted.

14. COMNAVRESFOR IG is in possession of additional evidence including: digital recordings of interviews with DCOIC students identified above as Student #1, Student #2, and Student #3; (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) original complaint, the 1 June 2010 email described above; and (b)(6) (b)(7)(c) testimony. The COMNAVRESFOR IG POC for this matter is (b)(6) (b)(7)(c), Investigations Program (b)(6) (b)(7)(c). He may be reached at COMM: (757) 322-(b)(6) (b)(7)(c), DSN: 262-(b)(6) (b)(7)(c), or (b)(6) (b)(7)(c)@navy.mil.

(b)(6) (b)(7)(c)